



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ment of such cadet companies and for the promotion of rifle practice therein. The sum of \$5,000 was appropriated for this purpose. This act also provided that only those schools that had 40 or more boys fourteen years of age and over could have military drill, as each company must have at least forty members.

This provision excludes probably 104 of the small high schools, whose daily attendance of boys does not average forty for each school. Furthermore, the opposition of school principals and trustees to military drill still further increases the number of schools that have no military companies. Any person familiar with the schools of California knows that there is considerable opposition of that sort. Would that there were more!

The act of April 5, 1911, was amended May 18, 1915, and again May 20, 1915. The first of these amendments provided for the appropriation of \$13,000 for defraying the expenses of the high-school cadet companies for two years. The act of May 20, 1915, provides somewhat in detail for the equipment (obsolete rifles for drill, Springfield rifles for target practice), for uniforms, for officers, for U. S. Army drill regulations, and for supervision and inspection by the adjutant general of the State. The young boys are thus brought into close relations to the National Guard and occasionally, at least, with U. S. Army officers. The reason why is perfectly obvious. They seek to captivate the young minds with the pomp and glitter of military life.

Although the majority of these high-school military companies were organized before the European war began, nevertheless the persistent agitation for "preparedness" on the part of the United States has caused several new companies to be formed; probably five of the twenty-five now existing were organized after August 1, 1914. Several others were attempted, and thus far have failed through lack of interest on the part of the pupils.

Moreover, in three large cities of the State there were recent attempts to introduce military training in the schools. In Oakland the plan failed in one large school because some parents objected, the Socialists in particular, and the students were too busy with better things and were not captivated by the so-called "benefits" of military drill, though the principal of the school strongly favored it. In San Diego the board of education decided "to table" the plan presented to them by some ardent advocates of military instruction. Los Angeles had a lively "fight" on the subject before it was defeated. The peace victory seemed to hang in the balance for some time. A member of the board of education, who is, or was, a major in the National Guard of California, introduced a resolution in favor of *compulsory* military drill in Los Angeles schools. This aroused much opposition. The resolution was modified twice, and finally defeated by the board of education by a vote of four to three.

For this "famous victory" much credit is due to the able leadership of Mrs. R. J. Waters and ex-Judge Waldo M. York, of the board of education, and also to the efficient co-operation of Mrs. E. C. Bellows, chairman of the Woman's Peace Party; Mrs. Seward A. Simons, president of the Friday Morning Club; Gen. E. C. Bellows, president of the Southern California Peace Society; Mr. Reynolds E. Blight, former member of the board of education, and several other able helpers

who opposed the attempt to militarize the schools of one of our largest cities.

It may be of some interest to some readers to learn that only one public high school in southern California maintains military cadet companies—the Los Angeles High School. Four others in the same city have none. There are, however, three private military schools in the city. There is another private military school near San Diego. The remaining eleven public high schools that have military drill are the following: Alameda High School, with 660 pupils and three drill companies, with approximately 150 cadets; Auburn High School, 206 pupils (1914-1915) and one or more companies; Gilroy High School, 135 pupils; Marysville High School, 175 pupils; Oakland Technical High School, 1,900 pupils and two cadet companies, with 125 cadets; Sacramento, 1,171 pupils; San Francisco, three—Commercial High School, 1,159 pupils; Mission High School, 579 pupils; Technical High School, 575 pupils and one or more drill companies; Visalia High School, with 234 pupils, and San Jose, with nearly 1,300 pupils.

California peace workers need to work strenuously and pray devoutly that the number of cadet companies and the number of immature boys now taking military drill in the schools of the State may not increase, but rather decrease. If this comes to pass our peace forces must be alert and must not fall asleep "on guard."

THE CAUSE OF MODERN WARS

By DARWIN J. MESEROLE

CLOSELY allied to the question of military preparedness is the cause of wars—especially of the present great war.

It will be conceded that the European war is neither religious nor racial in its origin. There remains the other and most vital cause of international strife—the struggle for commercial supremacy in the markets of the world. It is here that we shall find the germ, or tap-root, of modern war. Germany's demand for "her place in the sun" is more than an imperialistic ambition; it is a natural and, under the present system of world commerce and industry, necessary right, to which she is entitled by her unprecedented development as a nation since 1870, in education, literature, art, music, government, industry, and commerce. The recognition of this right should lead us as vigorously to condemn the German nation's assent to the Bernhardt and Nietzsche doctrine of force and the approval of violations of solemn treaty obligations, while it is not difficult to understand when we consider the coalition of her three enemies, Russia, France, and England, unnatural because only an exigency of commercial or financial interest, which knows no law and has no sentiment, could bring together autocratic Russia, with its massacres and pogroms, and democratic England and France.

Under the modern system of industry, the profit and wage system, the workers of all the highly developed manufacturing and agricultural nations receive in wages but a fraction of what they produce, even in the United States. The surplus goes to those in every country who own the capital, the factories, the land, and other means of production and distribution. The workers, who are the market and consuming power of a nation, being un-

able to buy back these goods because of this small share of the product in their hands, it becomes necessary for the owners of this surplus to find markets outside the countries in which it is produced. The volume of exports is far greater than is required for the natural exchange between nations of commodities more readily produced under special climatic or other local conditions, or for payment of interest on foreign capital invested for the development of new countries.

For instance, some years ago in our own country, when the fact was pointed out that we exported hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat, and other hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of the product of our forests and factories, at the same time that the workers of the nation and their families had need of food, clothing, and proper housing, it was said by our financiers and economists that this was of course necessary in order to pay the interest on the billions of foreign capital that had been invested here to develop the new country. Now, when these same gentlemen are loudly proclaiming that we are a great creditor nation at last, when we are exporting hundreds of millions more than ever before, and in addition loaning hundreds of millions of money to European nations which may soon be bankrupt or whose people may some day repudiate these great war debts, we are told by these leaders of finance and industry that if we did not send these products abroad and also loan these nations the money to purchase them, there would be no market for the goods and we ourselves would soon be in the throes of an industrial panic and become bankrupt. That is, we, as a nation, having produced on our farms and from our mines and forests the largest crops and manufactured goods in the history of our country, are in a perilous condition because of this vast surplus wealth. And this condition exists in a nation whose wealth has increased in the past twenty-five years from 65 to 187 billions, or 188 per cent, whereas the aggregate income of the wage-earners has increased only 95 per cent, and the incomes of almost two-thirds of the wage-earners' families (including the earnings of father, mother, and children, for hundreds of thousands of children work in our factories ten and twelve hours a day, at a wage of \$2 to \$3 a week) were less than \$750 a year, and of almost one-third were less than \$500.

The advocates of preparedness at first confined themselves to a demand for preparedness to defend our coast from invasion, but as the movement has gathered momentum, the demand has become quite as strong for an army and navy big enough to defend our markets, our so-called "honor," and "our interests." We are asked by the President to protect the flag, and are told that "the flag stands for honor, not for advantage," and "for the rights of mankind, no matter where they be."

A country that has in its recent industrial history such strife and conflict as was seen in West Virginia, Colorado, Lawrence, Paterson, Youngstown, cannot boast of honor, and is not at peace; and if its citizens do not as a first duty correct the cause of such discord, they are not worthy of the degree of liberty they may enjoy, and in time they will lose it.

No nation that allows its laws to be violated with impunity by the strong, in crushing the weak, can stand forth before the world as the champion of the sanctity of international law. No nation whose wealth has increased without parallel in history can overwork and

underpay its workers, force its mothers and daughters into its factories, crush out the lives of its children in its mills, withhold from millions of its citizens the opportunity to earn a living, and at the same time have the flag of that country stand "for the rights of mankind, no matter where they be."

I am not given to quoting the law to illustrate an ethical point. I feel, with Clarence Darrow, who said that he had practiced law too long to have any idea of the justice of the law, and with the biting sarcasm of Anatole France: "The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich, as well as the poor, to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread." Yet there is a principle of equity which applies here: "He who comes into equity must do so with clean hands." Can we forget the political corruption of our cities and States; the denial of justice in our courts to the workers; the exploitation of our wage-earners in times of so-called prosperity, and the casting of them aside to starve in times of "industrial depression"; the persecution, lynching, and disenfranchisement of the colored people, for whose freedom and liberty we proclaim the Civil War was fought; and the abject servility and moral shame of a people who, under such economic conditions as exist in America, not only do not effectively protest against a system of government which allows one man in a single lifetime, by breaking every law of God and man, to amass a fortune of one thousand millions of dollars, but, in many cases, seek to emulate his example?

Internationally interpreted, "our honor" and "our policies" mean simply the protection, by battleships and armies, of the commercial interests in foreign lands of a small group of capitalists, in every dominant nation.

"Our honor" would better be established at home before we attempt to defend it abroad. In the light of recent events in the industrial history of our country, we owe our first duty, as a matter of national defense, to our own land, seeking to change conditions which are a disgrace to the nation. No amount of expenditure for battleships and armaments can protect a nation that refuses justice to its own people. The best defense a nation can have is a happy, contented, and prosperous people. True patriotism can neither take root nor thrive in any other soil.

There is but one honest and effective preparedness. Let us put our own house in order. Eliminate poverty from the homes of all who are able and willing to work in this country, teeming with wealth and with its natural resources almost untouched. Mobilize the industrial power of our country. Conserve the products of labor for the benefit of all the people, instead of for the few. Let us realize that the exigency of peace is as great as the emergency of war; that the fatalities of poverty, through disease, insanity, prostitution, and crime, are as terrible as in war, and that a new order of industry in times of peace, as in times of war, may emancipate a nation and a world; and that nothing else can. Let us make America a real democracy.

THE INCREASE proposed by the present naval bill represents \$90,000,000 over last year, making the total \$240,000,000. The present army program, besides increasing the present military strength to approximately 225,000 men, provides also for the expenditure of approximately \$70,000,000 upon the National Guard, increasing it to over 450,000 men, 800 in each congressional district, all supplied with guns, funds, court-martial, and the vote.